

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/265,669	03/10/1999	KEN MAKITA	251002009000	4798
7:	590 02/27/2002			
MORRISON & FOERSTER			EXAMINER	
	LVANIA AVENUE N. N, DC 200061888	W.	SHEEHAN, JOHN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	15
			DATE MAILED: 02/27/2002	17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			ME
*	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/265,669	KAKITA ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John P. Sheehan	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communic	ation appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence add	dress
THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2002 FAILS Therefore, further action by the applicant is requinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR	puired to avoid abandonment of this e either: (1) a timely filed amendme e of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	s application. A proper re ent which places the appl	eply to a ication in
· · · ·	FOR REPLY [check either a) or b	))]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing dat event, however, will the statutory period for reply e ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST R 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pe 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of to above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing EPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS (a). The date on which the petition under 37 riod of extension and the corresponding amount in the shortened statutory period for reply original.	ng date of the final rejection.  OF THE FINAL REJECTION.  CFR 1.136(a) and the appropria  unt of the fee. The appropriate exily  lly set in the final Office action; o	See MPEP  te extension fee  xtension fee under  r (2) as set forth in
A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>19 Febru</u> 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension there			et forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be	entered because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would red	quire further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);	;
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (s	see Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the apsissues for appeal; and/or	oplication in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims with NOTE:	out canceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected cla	ims.
B. Applicant's reply has overcome the follow	wing rejection(s): See Continuation S	<u>Sheet</u> .	
1. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely file	ed amendment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ application in condition for allowance be		en considered but does N	OT place the
5. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be cons raised by the Examiner in the final rejec		OLELY to issues which w	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed ar explanation of how the new or amended			d and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) a	as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,44 and 45.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·		
$B. \square$ The proposed drawing correction filed or	n is a)□ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Exa	miner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure	e Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)	
0. Other:		John P. Sheehan Primary Examiner	
Patent and Trademark Office		Art Unit: 1742	





Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): All of the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Final rejection mailed August 17, 2001.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner maintains the postion that the claims do not recite a rare earth free boundary phase. In claims 1 to 4 the use of the term, "consisiting essentially of" does not preclude the presence of rare earths from the grain boundary. The claims require the presence of a cation in the grain boundary and applicants in their argument have stated that rare earths are cations. If rare earths are cations and the claims require that the boundary phase contain cations how could rare earths be considered as affecting the basic and novel characteristic of the invention and thus be precluded by "consisting essentially of". Further, in the absence of a clear indication in the claims or the specification of what the basic and novel charistics are "consisiting essentially of' can be construed as "comprising", MPEP 2111.03. With respect to claim 45, the phrase, "a source" does not limit the source of the cations to the members of the Marksu Group but rather merely describes one source of the cations and does not preclude cations from other sources. Even if claim 45 were amended to recite "the source" of cations this would mean that one of the cations recited in the Markush would have to be present but the claim would not preclude cations from other sources such as rare earth metals.